DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 367 495 PS 022 172

TITLE	FAAIR Coalition Report.
INSTITUTION	Windflower Enterprises, Colorado Springs, CO.
PUB DATE	Jan 93
NOTE	11p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Windflower Enterprises, 815 North Nevada Avenue, Suite 1, Colorado Springs, CO 80903 (all updates and reports included in $8 membership).
PUB TYPE	Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Advocacy; Caregiver Role; Child Caregivers; Early Childhood Education; *Family Day Care; National Organizations; *Politics of Education; *Professional Development; Standards; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS	Caregiver Training; *FAAIR Coalition; *National Association Educ of Young Children

ABSTRACT

The FAAIR Coalition was created to address the growing career development movement and its impact on family day care. FAAIR is an acronym for Flexibility, Attainability, Affordability, Inclusiveness, and Respect for others. The coalition was founded in 1992 in response to a draft Professional Development Model for family day care providers produced by the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC). The NAEYC report contained what the FAAIR Coalition considered to be unfair training burdens for family day care providers and unfair definitions of what constituted a child care professional; the Coalition claimed the report was prepared with little or no input from family day care providers or advocates. A more recent version of the NAEYC report has addressed some of these deficiencies, but is still unacceptable to FAAIR. Family day care providers are urged to join the FAAIR Coalition to help it advocate appropriate standards for family day care. (MDM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

FAAIR Coalition Report

Submitted by Windflower Enterprises, January 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Cheryl-Ann Whitehead
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED 367 495

Background

Windflower first learned of the emerging career development concept in late 1990, when Wheelock College in Boston established The Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education. In early 1991, we also obtained a copy of NAEYC's Professional Development Model (Draft, 8/9/90).

During the planning stages for our new publication, *The Language of Money and Family Child Care* (a collection of essays regarding compensation issues), our interest in the career development movement was peaked. We were very interested in the concept as a strategy for promoting education and training, thereby improving the quality of child care and increasing provider longevity. At the same time we were concerned about how the concept, in practice, would impact the family child care field. We were also nervous about the fact that awareness of this new issue (not to mention involvement) was minimal in the family child care community, even though the ideas and strategies that were being put forward included family child care providers.

After analyzing both NAEYC's Professional Development Model (Draft 8/9/90) and preliminary reports of The Center's involvement in the career development movement, Windflower was convinced that the issue needed to be addressed in *The Language of Money (LOM)*, particularly since it was clear that the career development concept was directly related to compensation. It was also clear that much of the information we were reading on the concept either lacked a broad-based family child care perspective, contained serious omissions or appeared to promote ideas that could have negative consequences for family child care.

In September 1991, at the beginning of the development phase of *LOM*, NAEYC announced the launching of their new division, the National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development. They also announced the Institute's first annual, national conference on professional development, to be held in Los Angeles, June 3-6, 1992.

Planning for the release of *LOM* at the Save The Children, Family Child Care Technical Assistance Conference (TAC) in April 1992, we contacted NAEYC to request an updated draft of their Professional Development Model to ensure that the analysis we intended to publish would be current, and to let them know that we planned to critique the model. We were unable to peak NAEYC's interest in our project but we did learn that a new draft would not be available until their upcoming June conference -- a month and a half after our release date. After struggling with the timing problem, we decided it was important to get existing information on the issue out to the family child care community as a starting point for discussion; particularly since most family child care providers were unaware of either the movement toward career development or those concepts that had been presented thus far. We were aware that the information, and therefore the publication, would have to be updated as the issue evolved. And, although a new draft was unavailable, NAEYC had published several articles that indicated the direction in which it was headed, in its magazine *Young Children*.

PS 022172

At the same time we were in contact with The Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education at Wheelock College. The Center had published several concept and discussion papers on comprehensive training and career development systems. They were interested in our project and very responsive to our ideas about career development and family child care.

As the final stages of putting *LOM* together approached, it became obvious that the career development movement would continue to accelerate with or without family child care involvement. We felt strongly that the issue was too important to allow it to emerge without a broad base of family child care participation and in order to accomplish this an organized advocacy effort was needed. We decided to create an ad hoc coalition to bring together providers and others who support family child care to facilitate participation. At the end of the

article that appeared in *LOM*, "Education, Career Development and Our Worth in the Marketplace," we added a list of guiding principles for family child care career development, from our perspective -- **F**lexibility, **A**ttainability, **A**ffordability, **I**nclusiveness and **R**espect for Diversity. We also included a first pass at offering suggested concepts and components for a family child care career development model. This was the beginning of the FAAIR Coalition.

At the time, we did not have a clear vision of what the Coalition would be, how we would organize it, or what it's role would be. We also had no idea what format the NAEYC Conference in Los Angeles would adopt or what to expect as the outcome. But we knew it was essential to organize the family child care community around this issue. We asked readers to send us their feedback on both the article and the preliminary family child care model before the NAEYC conference in June, and/or to join the FAAIR Coalition. Although we were unsure what the new draft of the NAEYC Professional Development Model would contain when it was released in June, we wanted to be ready with feedback on the existing draft.

At TAC in April 1992, we held the first FAAIR Coalition discussion group. It was attended by a small but very interested, responsive group of family child care providers and others. We distributed the article and FAAIR Coalition excerpt from *LOM* and again asked for input as soon as possible. Windflower planned to be represented at the NAEYC conference and as it turned out, we were invited to send a representative to present information regarding our training program.

Immediately following TAC, Windflower sent out a small targeted mailing of the same material, again asking for feedback prior to June. We also sent the information to Sue Bredekamp, Director of Professional Development at NAEYC. She responded by telephone and was very gracious. She complimented our analysis and welcomed the involvement of family child care in the issue. We also understood from that conversation that the June conference would be an opportunity for more discussion and that the draft that was to be released would not be the final draft.

Although the turnaround time was short, we did receive a surprising number of responses to the information we distributed prior to June. A few days before the conference, however, Windflower determined that we did not yet have enough feedback, nor did it represent a large enough base, to put it together and present in Los Angeles.

However, the responses we received were certainly noteworthy. We heard from family child care providers, resource and referral staff and several center-based caregivers. All of our respondents were very supportive of our analysis and of the suggested concepts and components we published and there was a healthy diversity of ideas about how different areas of career development should be handled for family child care.

Many of the letters we received were not so much responding to specifics as they were venting frustration about the lack of recognition of informal education, lack of respect as child care professionals, or the dismal compensation coupled with the absence of benefits. We were touched by the heartfelt, thoughtful and beautifully written letters we received. Our thanks to all who responded. As usual, those with whom we network enrich us and give us much to consider. Many of the ideas and concepts that were offered will be incorporated into the next draft of the family child care career development model that was first published in *LOM*.

NAEYC National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development Conference

Cheryl Whitehead, of Windflower Enterprises, attended the conference in Los Angeles in June 1992, and offers the following report.

The conference was incredibly stimulating -- everyone seemed alive with the anticipation of sharing. NAEYC did a great job of bringing the name of the conference, "The Early Childhood Profession Coming

Together" to life -- setting a tone of respect for the diversity of views and opinions. I witnessed many participants who, although holding tightly to their perspective, were at least very respectful of others' ideas.

I was also impressed by the sheer numbers in attendance -- reportedly 700 people. It was difficult, however, to be part of only a handful of attenders that were representing family child care. As best I could determine there were less than 20 and of that number, only a few providers. This served to emphasize the lack of awareness or involvement in this issue by the family child care profession.

One of the reasons the turnout for the conference was so high was the post-conference technical assistance day sponsored by The Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education at Wheelock College, with funding from Rockefeller Brothers. Teams of key decision makers from 40 states participated in this session. State teams included representatives from regulatory agencies, education departments, block grant administrators, and other key decision makers. Unfortunately, only a handful of states brought representatives for whom family child care was high on the agenda but there's no doubt that gathering state policy and child care people in the spirit of working together was an incredible contribution to the entire field. Discussion included career development systems, standards, financing, legislation and other related issues. The presence of teams from 40 states further demonstrated the acceleration of the career development movement (and all the related issues) at the regulatory and state policy level, fueled by federal and private funding.

Each of the four concurrent blocks offered at the conference included a stimulating mix of topics and presenters. There was a choice of four or five presentations and one or two working sessions (open discussion with a facilitator) in each block. There were also three general sessions. Very often I was torn as to which session to attend. Ironically, several of the presentations I felt important to attend were held during the same block in which I was scheduled to present.

Some of the topics included: Delivery system models for professional development; Developing standards for qualifications of trainers; State and community plans for early childhood professional development; Developing standards for in-service (ongoing) training; Professional development linked to compensation; Innovative models and promising practices; Refining the Model for Early Childhood Professional Development; Foundation interests in early childhood professional development; Developing public policy and legislation to promote professional development; Evaluating training curricula; Defining the core content: What every early childhood professional should know.

The breadth of the subject matter was head-spinning but it illustrates many of the pieces that make up the career/professional development whole and the areas that many states, and NAEYC's National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development, will certainly address.

Each participant received a booklet containing Concept Papers (reprints of the Institute's articles that first appeared in *Young Children*), and a booklet of Background Materials for Working Sessions. This booklet contained not only the updated draft of the Institute's Professional Development Model but a draft of "NAEYC Guidelines for Continuing Education or In-service Preparation of Early Childhood Personnel." These guidelines were originally part of the first NAEYC Professional Development Model but have now been separated. The booklet also contained a list of questions for the working sessions on Standards for Trainers and Criteria for Training Curricula. Again, these are related areas in which NAEYC intends to exert its influence.

Each participant also received *Career Progression in Early Care and Education: A Discussion Paper* written by Gwen Morgan and published by The Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education at Wheelock College. A copy of the latest version of this paper is enclosed by permission of The Center. Of particular interest in the paper is the "bridge" or Transitional System that was reviewed in *LOM*. This latest version reflects changes in some of the language that we find very positive. This exciting vision for the bridging of formal and informal education is one that family child care needs to study carefully.

Of the sessions that I was able to attend, the most unsettling was the working session on Standards for Qualifications of Trainers. The majority of participants in this session were either representing center-based care, academia, regulation or resource and referral. Many of the ideas shared leaned very heavily toward a narrow definition of who could qualify as a trainer. It was disturbing because the value of peer trainers is just being discovered in the field. I was also concerned that there seemed to be no path for growth as a trainer and no room for trainers who did not hold a college degree of some sort.

Without a doubt, the most exciting session I attended was the General Session entitled, "State of the Art Professional Development: How and What Should we Teach Adults to Teach Young Children?" Presenters included Edward Greene, Center for Educational Programs in New York; Elizabeth Jones, Pacific Oaks College, CA and David Weikart, High/Scope Educational Research Foundation, MI. Presentations offered many cutting edge ideas and questions. I was especially impressed by comments about the need to encourage caregivers to invest in self-understanding: who am I and why am I interested in caring for children; what is it I believe in? To encourage ongoing self-assessment and self-development. To avoid the common pitfall in education (child as well as adult education) that results in the wide chasm between knowledge and theory and its application. Too often caregivers are filled with knowledge or information but unguided as to how to integrate it into practice -- "connection of information" was the term used.

Overall, I was very impressed with the conference but concerned that so many of the important issues affecting our field were being discussed with so little family child care input.

NAEYC Model of Early Childhood Professional Development - 5/92 Draft

In an effort to demonstrate the progression of the Professional Development Model, we felt it was useful to discuss the changes that were reflected in the second draft, and our concerns with it, before moving on to look at the latest draft (11/92).

Most of the changes reflected in this draft were those that appeared in *Young Children*, and discussed in *LOM*. In this draft, as it appeared in *Young Children* (March, 1992), the core content areas that represent the body of knowledge needed by all early childhood professionals, were given category labels in addition to the definition that had appeared in the first draft. The seven content areas included: child development; healthy, safe environment; developmentally appropriate curriculum; guidance; family relationships; cultural and individual diversity; and professionalism.

Although the language in this draft is somewhat softened (the term "nonprofessional" has been eliminated), the CDA is again considered the basic credential (versus "minimum credential") for early childhood professionals. The Definitions of Early Childhood Professional Categories table listed in this draft is very cleverly put together. Individuals who would had been categorized as "Nonprofessional/Pre-professional" in the previous draft are now listed as "Pre-Credentialed Individuals." As described, these are individuals who are either students enrolled in a program leading to a "recognized credential" (CDA, AA, BA, etc.) or those who are employed in a child care setting under the supervision of a "qualified early childhood professional."

Although "Pre-credentialed Individuals" is the first category listed on the Definitions of Early Childhood Professional Categories table, the word professional is noticeably absent. Family child care providers who have not yet obtained the "basic" credential, either a CDA or a "credential that conforms to the Model CDA Curriculum of the Council for Early Childhood Professional Recognition," would be in the "Pre-credentialed" category. The result, being considered "outside" the profession, is the same even though the inflammatory language has been removed and the intent is unspoken. By contrast, the next level on the table, and all those that follow, are called Early Childhood **Credentialed Professionals** (Levels I - V). Once again, we are concerned that family child care providers who have extensive training, knowledge and experience in the core content areas, but do not have a CDA Credential, would be considered pre-credentialed and therefore, inherently, pre-professional.

Interestingly, while the core content categories identified in this draft include the seven areas mentioned above, the guidelines listed for "conforming to the Model CDA Curriculum" include eight content areas. The additional category listed under the Model CDA Curriculum is Observation and Assessment. There is no explanation for the discrepancy.

This draft incorporates the lattice approach first introduced in *Young Children* (March, 1992) but takes it one step further, addressing the concern we expressed in *LOM* by asserting that steps on the ladder, or lattice, should not require changing roles. In other words, caregivers should be recognized and compensated for professional growth and development without having to give up working directly with children. Our concern is whether this principle would indeed hold true in actual practice.

In the final table of this draft, Overview of Roles in Early Childhood Programs and Recommended Qualifications, the elimination of the Non-professional/Pre-professional category was noted. In the previous draft, Teaching Assistants or Aides were listed under this category. Again, the implication is still present even though the category is omitted.

There was no change in the description of a family child care provider but there was a change in the acceptable qualifications. In the first draft, the minimum acceptable qualification was either a CDA Credential or enrollment in a training program preparing an individual to obtain a CDA. In this draft, acceptable qualifications were listed as follows:

> *Individuals linked to a system providing ongoing training and/or evaluation mechanisms, such as accreditation by the National Association for Family Day Care (NAFDC), OR possession of a CDA Credential in Family Day Care.*

Although this is a very positive change, it is confusing and inconsistent. Nowhere in the body of this draft or on the Definitions of Early Childhood Professional Categories table, is the NAFDC Accreditation listed as being equivalent to a CDA.

NAEYC Model of Early Childhood Professional Development - Final Draft 11/92

A copy of this latest, "final" draft is included with this report. Below is a discussion of the changes and our position on those changes.

We were happy to see that in this latest draft several of the confusing issues or inconsistencies we addressed in the 5/92 draft have been clarified. For instance, the core content areas have been expanded to eight, including the Observation and Assessment category that meets the Model CDA Curriculum guidelines. A lingering concern about the core content areas, however, is the language used in the descriptions; it is language that would be appropriate for center-based care and in some cases is totally inappropriate for family child care. Additionally, this core of knowledge is incomplete as it relates to family child care (e.g., business management). The draft readily admits this omission pointing out that the core content is identified only as the body of knowledge that all professionals in the field would need, regardless of setting.

The discrepancy with the NAFDC Accreditation has also been eliminated. The good news is that the NAFDC Accreditation is now fully accepted as a minimum requirement for obtaining status as an Early Childhood Credentialed Professional, Level I, Step 1. The bad news is that a provider who is without the NAFDC Accreditation but has invested hundreds of hours in informal education/training and years of experience in child care, will not be given the Level I status. And we must keep in mind that it is the intention of the model to have these levels tied to a compensation or salary index, included in this draft.

This is particularly confusing since the draft at least acknowledges that problems and gaps still exist; it admits that "there is not yet a systematic way to accumulate credit for diverse training experiences." In other

words, some method for translating, or articulating, informal education/training experiences into formal credit. The draft further asserts that "tackling these issues by promoting a high-quality system of comprehensive and articulated professional preparation is the major goal of NAEYC's Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development." We then have to ask why this model is being called the "Final Draft" when it is clear that there are many more questions to ask and many more areas to be developed before we should call this a done deal.

There is more bad news in this "final" draft. As written and as we understand it, this model creates a sort of "glass ceiling" for family child care (and many center-based caregivers) by virtue of the requirements to move from Level I, Step 1 to Level I, Step 2. In Table 3, Definitions of Early Childhood Professional Categories, in order to move to Step 2 (never mind the next Level), a provider would have to invest in "15 semester hours of relevant continuing education." If the model is consistent in the terms it uses, 1 semester hour is defined on Page 11 of the model as being equivalent to 16 clock hours. Therefore, 15 semester hours would be the equivalent of 240 clock hours of continuing education!

To date and to our knowledge, the highest number of annual ongoing education hours required by state regulation for family child care providers is 20 hours. Two other states require 15; most are 12 or lower. Generally these hours are within the realm of reasonable expectations considering the number of hours that family child care providers work and the diversity of jobs/responsibilities, when compared to most center-based caregivers, and the question of available, relevant, reality-based training opportunities. Most continuing education/training for family child care providers would have to be obtained in the evenings, following 10-to-12 hour days, not to mention prep time, or on the weekends following extremely long weeks. If classes were attended during the day, a qualified substitute must be located and paid, on top of the cost of the education/training itself. And, although it's difficult to fathom, in some locations the use of a qualified family child care substitute is prohibited or extremely limited.

Setting aside these objections, however, even if a family child care provider chose to invest in 40 clock hours of annual ongoing education (double the highest existing state annual requirements), it would take approximately 6 years for a provider to obtain enough clock hours to move up to Level I, Step 2! Not only is this unreasonable, it becomes even more shocking when these levels are tied to compensation, as shown on the Salary Index, Page 12, and considering the implications when these levels become known and accepted among child care consumers. In addition, even if a provider achieved this goal in order to move to Level I, Step 2, advancement to Level II would be impossible without the benefit of an associate degree. [It should be pointed out that there is a distinction between the hours of continuing education required to move from level to level and the separate issue of recommendations for annual continuing education. The Professional Development Model suggests 24 clock hours per year for all professionals in the field.]

If this model was implemented as it exists, the opportunities for advancement for most family child care providers, in terms of professional recognition or compensation, would be minimal at best -- unless they chose to obtain an additional credential (AA, BA, etc.) either by investing years of part time college attendence or by leaving care to become a full time student. This creates a glass ceiling effect. There is also the question of what constitutes "relevant continuing education" -- not necessarily in terms of content, but in terms of setting. If advancement beyond Level I is not possible without choosing to obtain a college degree, the important element of choice -- the choice of educational settings that best meet the individual needs -- is removed. This is particularly so if these guidelines are implemented without a system in place for the articulation of informal education (specialized workshops, seminars, courses, etc.), since this is the environment in which most family child care providers already in the field obtain their education/training. Although NAEYC's Guidelines for Continuing Education or In-service Preparation of Early Childhood Personnel (Draft, 5/92) encourages the development of articulation mechanisms, how can the Professional Development Model be completed or implemented before these "bridging" systems are explored and developed? NAEYC seems to acknowledge the value of informal education on one hand yet take away it's value with the other by trying to push all caregivers into formal education -- if they wish to be recognized and compensated for their growth and development. Even if the model included suggestions for the articulation of informal education there is still the

question of the number of clock hours required to move from level to level and step to step.

Equally disturbing, there is very little encouragement for the assessment or demonstration of competency based on experience, as well as informal education, that could then be articulated into formal credit. We believe that many veteran family child care providers could demonstrate competency in the core content areas, beyond the level measured by the NAFDC Accreditation, without benefit of a CDA, AA, or BA. This is a compelling argument for the development of a credential more accessible and more specific to family child care than the CDA, that would measure core content competency in a variety of ways (written, oral, demonstrated) and could be repeated as the provider experienced the "expanding core of knowledge and skills" (Figure 3, Pg. 7 of the PDM enclosed) through ongoing experience and education. Windflower has been exploring the notion of a Family Child Care Core Content Assessment.

If NAEYC wishes to promote professional development they need to join the efforts of The Center for Career Development in Early Care and Education, and take responsibility for helping to develop articulation models. As it exists it gives the appearance of creating a "clique" or "club" that would leave most caregivers -- center and home-based -- out in the cold and on the bottom. How can this serve the profession or children and families? This model sorely needs to be expanded and broadened. Again, we feel that this model is not even close to being ready for "final draft" status. Much discussion and consensus-building is ahead before the field can hope to adopt a career development system that truly meets the needs of all caregivers and still promotes quality care and education for all children.

In conclusion, we believe that it's important to recognize that family child care is still an emerging profession and we have a lot more work to do in deciding how it should be a profession. How will we define professionalism for family child care while safeguarding the informality and "homey-ness" of our work? Why must we be thrust into a model -- with very little input from providers -- that doesn't meet our needs or appreciate the fact that our profession is only now beginning to emerge and organize? After reviewing this latest draft of the NAEYC model, and considering the special and unique nature of family child care, we believe it is vital to develop a career/professional development model that is specific to our field, with a bridge to other models.

According to the 1988 Census Report, approximately half of the children in care in this country are in a family child care setting. And yet, we have a major movement developing in our field in which family child care is almost invisible. It is *critical* that family child care providers and those who support the profession, become involved in this issue NOW! Without flexing our political power we will be without a voice, unable to influence the process or the outcome. Below we have included a piece that was excerpted and adapted from the article that first appeared in *The Language of Money and Family Child Care*, "Education, Career Development and Our Worth in the Marketplace." It expresses the urgency of addressing these issues in an organized advocacy effort.

EXCERPTED AND ADAPTED FROM *THE LANGUAGE OF MONEY AND FAMILY CHILD CARE*

We cannot pretend that the movement toward defining career development systems will not affect family child care. And we cannot afford to leave the job of defining an appropriate model for our profession to non-practitioners or those with a center-based focus. Family child care *must* be at the forefront of this movement, particularly since statistics show that parents so frequently look to family child care to provide the environment they want for their children. As parent consumers become more aware and involved in this movement, making choices about quality based on the information they receive about professionalism and career development, we need to ensure that parents who want family child care are not led to believe that they are choosing care that is outside of a professional system or is substandard care, because providers are placed inappropriately within an exclusive professional development model.

We must think about the possible consequences of *not* becoming involved in the movement and having to live with a career development system that is not sensitive to family child care. Where would we "place" and how would it impact our income? If career development is a strategy for raising compensation, as claimed, will it truly accomplish this? Will it serve family child care, or merely redistribute the child care dollars available, leaving many family child care providers on the bottom rungs of the compensation ladder? We must join together to address quality and career development for family child care from our unique perspective; to develop a model that works for family child care and has widespread buy-in from providers. Family child care is just emerging and becoming visible; if we're not careful, if we don't design a model that is reasonable and accessible to providers, we may drive it back "underground."

The career or professional development movement -- with or without our participation -- will ultimately mean a call for increasing the required qualifications of caregivers, and some way to measure these qualifications. If family child care adopts a method of assessing competency by virtue of experience, many providers will benefit. However, experience alone will not be acceptable as a replacement for ongoing education and training. We must continue to explore ways in which providers who invest in many forms of quality education or training -- outside the college system -- can be recognized for their investment.

Whether we decide to "throw in" with other models, hoping to influence the necessary changes, or develop our own customized model and then look to create bridges to other models designed for other settings, we have to be prepared to say what we want and need -- *we* are the experts in family child care.

Based on NAEYC's admitted goals, and the attendance at their June conference by teams from 40 states, this movement *will* continue forward. The train is coming down the track and it's heading right for us. The question is, will family child care determine what track the train will take, or will we let it roll right over us? Our challenge is to determine what career/professional development means to family child care -- before it is determined for us. We need to formulate our ideas, work along side caregivers from other settings and ensure that, in the end, all the trains have adjoining tracks. After all, we're all headed for the same station -- quality child care.

THE ROLE OF THE FAAIR COALITION

Over the past eight months, as we have networked with family child care providers and others throughout the country, the role of the FAAIR Coalition has evolved. We have an opportunity to not only organize around the career/professional development issue, but to influence its outcome.

Below is the report of our activities, results of networking, and plans for the immediate future:

✾ Windflower has continued to talk about this issue and distribute information at every opportunity: Second Helping Instructor trainings, national and regional conferences, mailings and telephone contacts, and distribution of *The Language of Money* publication.

✾ The National Association for Family Day Care (NAFDC) has assigned a member of their board, Deborah Eaton, to act as liaison to the FAAIR Coalition. We are looking forward to working with NAFDC to bring this important issue to the forefront.

✾ Our newly formed corporation, The Windflower Institute, has announced the publication of a national, quarterly newsletter called *The Garden: Sharing the Professional Growth of Family Child Care*, debuting in March 1993. The premier issue will highlight the career development movement and the FAAIR Coalition.

✾ The FAAIR Coalition will send a letter to NAEYC's National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development Institute asking that the "final draft" status of the current development model be withdrawn and that it be re-released as the latest draft only, and encouraging the Institute to expand its efforts to stimulate

widespread participation among practitioners, building consensus slowly, over time.

✾ With the assistance of Save The Children, we will hold a FAAIR Coalition Planning Session during the Family Child Care Technical Assistance Conference in Atlanta, April 22-25, 1993. NAFDC representatives will also participate.

✾ Following the conference in Atlanta, the FAAIR Coalition will release a position statement that will comment on NAEYC's model and the issues that should be addressed, and will include the latest version of the Career Development Model for Family Child Care based on the input and feedback we receive from Coalition members. This model first appeared as part of the career development article in *The Language of Money*. [If you have not yet seen the model or the original article, you may order the entire publication or a reprint of the article.] FAAIR Coalition members will receive an updated report following the conference as well as the draft of the position statement, in order to respond and give input before the final is released. The position statement will eventually be made available to every state working to establish a comprehensive training and career development system.

✾ This year's National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development conference will be held in Minneapolis, June 2-5, 1993. The FAAIR Coalition will contact NAEYC and offer assistance in planning for the inclusion and participation of family child care in the conference.

✾ The FAAIR Coalition will be encouraging family child care providers from all over the country to attend the conference. With the assistance of the Child Care Workers Alliance in Minneapolis and the Minnesota family child care community, we hope to fill the conference with family child care providers. We encourage all associations and agencies to budget now to sponsor provider attendance. The FAAIR Coalition will present its position statement to the conference and, if possible, collect the signatures of as many family child care providers and supporters as possible to present along with the position statement.

MOVING AHEAD WITH THE F-A-A-I-R COALITION

It's now time to "gather the troops"; to encourage as many family child care providers and support agencies as possible to join our efforts. Why? Because the reality is that unless we come from a position of organized strength -- in terms of sheer numbers -- we will have very little influence on the development and implementation of professional development systems, nationally and on a state-by-state basis.

We encourage every member of the FAAIR Coalition to photocopy some or all of this report and distribute it to as many people as possible. We encourage you to make the information available to your association members and support service agencies. As mentioned earlier, one of our biggest challenges is simply to bring the family child care community up to speed on the issue.

We also encourage everyone reading this report who is not already a member of the FAAIR Coalition to complete the membership coupon on the next page and send it in right away. **FAMILY CHILD CARE NEEDS YOUR HELP! THE FAAIR COALITION NEEDS YOUR SUPPORT IN ORDER TO CONTINUE ITS ADVOCACY EFFORTS!**

If you have any questions, please contact us by writing to: **Windflower Enterprises, 142 S. Claremont Street, Colorado Springs, CO 80910**. Or call: **(719) 520-1614**.

JOIN THE F-A-A-I-R COALITION!
...BECAUSE FAMILY CHILD CARE DESERVES F-A-A-I-R CAREER DEVELOPMENT

WHAT IS THE FAAIR COALITION? An ad hoc group organized by Windflower Enterprises to address the growing career development movement and its impact on family child care in the United States, including regulation, education requirements and compensation. F-A-A-I-R is an acronym for: flexibility - attainability - affordability - inclusiveness - respect for diversity. These are the components that should be incorporated into the definition of professionalism or any career development system for family child care.

WHY IS IT IMPORTANT NOW? Because approximately one half of all the children in care in the United States are in a family child care setting, according to the 1988 Census Report...Because a number of states are currently working on or planning the implementation of comprehensive training and career development systems, and many more are moving toward it...Because NAEYC's National Institute for Early Childhood Professional Development has released a draft Professional Development Model that includes family child care, yet it was developed with very little input from the provider community and is unworkable for family child care...Because NAEYC is a large and powerful organization the final version of its model will enjoy widespread dissemination and possible influence on state policy makers, funders, regulatory agencies and consumers ...Because without the political power of numbers we have little chance of influencing the process or the outcome of this movement.

WHAT ARE THE GOALS OF THE FAAIR COALITION? To join together family child care providers and others in an organized advocacy effort...To ensure that the voice of family child care is represented in this major movement toward comprehensive training and career development systems...To prepare feedback and alternative ideas that are workable and speak to the unique and special nature of family child care...To stimulate and facilitate discussions about professionalism and career development and what it means to family child care ...To explore the development of a model specific to family child care...To collect and compile input and distribute it to Coalition members...To work toward consensus among family child care providers on professionalism and career development issues...To prepare updates and reports and offer technical assistance to Coalition members...To publish position statements based on the consensus of Coalition members.

Family child care providers and supporters are invited to add their voice to the FAAIR Coalition by becoming a member. Anyone is welcome to become a member at no cost, however, if you would like to receive reports and special mailings on Coalition activities, we ask that you send $8.00 to cover the cost of photocopies and postage. Members who receive Coalition reports and mailings should feel free to photocopy and distribute the information to associations and providers in their community. But remember, whether you are a paid or unpaid member, we need your involvement!

(Check One)

☐ **Yes, I'd like to add my voice to the FAAIR Coalition and receive all reports and special mailings. Enclosed is my check for $8.00.**
I've already received a copy of the January 1993 Coalition Report: o Yes o No

☐ **Yes, I'd like to add my voice to the FAAIR Coalition. I will receive copies of reports and special mailings from others in my area.**

NAME:_____

BUSINESS OR AGENCY NAME:_____

ADDRESS:_____

CITY:_____ STATE:_____ ZIP:_____